DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 189 009 SO 012 707

AUTHOR Bosserman, Phillip
TITLE The Division of Labor and Leisure in Modern Society: A New Form of Solidarity.
PUB DATE Aug 79
NOTE 23p.: Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association (74th, Boston, MA, August 27-31, 1979).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Role; Futures (of Society); *Industrial Structure; *Leisure Time; Research Needs; *Social Change; Social Indicators; Social Integration; *Social Values; *Sociocultural Patterns; Sociology

ABSTRACT

The paper suggests that new values created by modern forms of leisure have intersected with critical changes in the work structure to form a new social pattern. The new pattern emerges from a crisis in industrial societies. Factors which have created this crisis include the rupture of the time frames of society (how work and non-work are allocated); changes in the division of labor (the decline of technical labor due to automation); scientific and technological changes; aesthetic-ethical mutations (new values evolving from people's use of and increasing desire for leisure); and major changes in the world's economy. The end result is a new social solidarity called corporate communalism. It is characterized by a scaling down of size, a recovery of community, an appreciation of tradition, and a new form of differentiated labor in which individuals diversify. However, one must be aware of two currents which run counter to these new patterns: the power of the marketplace, particularly advertising, and the ideology of progress which is closely related to growth and size. The author concludes that sociologists should study the contours of the new solidarity as a potential scientific research program. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED189009

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Phillip Bosserman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

THE DIVISION OF LABOR AND LEISURE IN MODERN SOCIETY: A NEW FORM OF SOLIDARITY*

Phillip Bosserman
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
Salisbury State College
Salisbury, Md. 21801

SP 012 707

*Paper prepared for Session No. 163, Leisure/Recreation, 74th Annual Meeting, American Sociological Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August, 1979

This paper has benefited from stimulating discussions with members of a National Endowment for the Humanities seminar in which the author participated at Duke University, June-August, 1978. For their rewarding intellectual interchanges I wish to thank E. A. Tiryakian, Seminar leader, G. Arnold, C. Barnes, W. Baum, L. Berrocal, V. Demos, J. Faught, J. Foreman, R. Haerle, B. Harrison, N. Robak, and J. Schuster.

The Division of Labor and Leisure in Modern Society:

A New Form of Solidarity

My present preoccupation has been with the problems of modernity in an advanced industrial society like the United States. I find an array of parallels in the problem of industrial modernity and Third World modernity. These problems are of such magnitude that we can safely call this period one of crisis (Sorokin: 1941). Discontinuities in older social forms and in the broad institutional life are apparent. These spell a change in the direction of a society's evolution. An indicator of societal crisis is systemic failure. Two simple examples come to mind.

This past winter in the Washington DC-Baltimore area we had the worst snowstorm in modern history. All of the economic activity was brought to a standstill. Transportation faltered and eventually failed. On the morrow after the storm, folks walked down the thoroughfare, knee deep in snow enjoying Pennsylvania Avenue without the streaming traffic of darting automobiles and lumbering trucks. A hush had settled over the city. People spoke to and helped one another as neighbors.

However, in nearby Baltimore the unseemly surfaced as social control faltered. Looters broke into stores in shopping areas taking everything they could, leaving behind strewn merchandise and broken plate glass windows. The police were unavailable, helpless in the unplowed streets to answer burglar alarms.

The current gasoline shortages created numerous incidents of violence in California with at least one person being killed in a squabble over who

would or wouldn't get fuel. The related independent truckers' strike has also produced violence.

The modern metropolis is the central core of what Durkheim (1933) called organic solidarity. In probing how modern society holds together, he came to the conclusion that the division of social[1] labor keeps the social body intact. Cooperation among all who participate is essential to the functioning of the society. Each individual cooperates with others who are performing different but equally required tasks in order that he/she can function in his or her role. The individual gains greater autonomy because of this interlocking interdependence. Such growth in individual freedom open up the system providing expansion and creativity with increased efficiency. Durkheim saw potential good emanating from this organic solidarity because the increasing division of labor provided individual freedom and creative expression. Everyone would gain and the interdependent cooperation assured a binding moral order, a social solidarity.

Systemic failures point to the obvious conclusion that the division of labor has not always led to individual freedom of movement and a sense of autonomy, as Durkheim insisted. Rather large scale organizations such as oil cartels and the state have stifled what Durkheim saw as the essential outcome of organic solidarity. (Gurvitch 1957:220). Durkheim did recognize in the celebrated preface to the second edition of The Division of Labor in Society that traditional institutions such as religion and the family were failing. In their place he saw the necessity of occupational groupings forming along the lines of the old "corporation" of the Middle Ages and Rome. "Instead of being limited only to the workers of a city, it must enlarge in such a way as to include all the members of the occupation scattered over a

territory, for in whatever region they are found, wherever they live in the city or the country, they are all solidary, and participate in a common life." (1933:24). Durkheim was recognizing that organic solidarity has its problems. The situation since his day has grown even more acute. I sense that out of this current period of anemie and discontinuity is emerging a new form of social solidarity. (In the words of William Butler Yeats "What rough beast slouches towards Bethlehem, to be born?") Such a solidarity necessarily will be the axis of the new type of society. The moral foundations indeed are shaking. Tiryakian (1967), Balandier (1973), and Drucher (1968) have catalogued a number of salient indicators of societal discontinuity marking a disruption in social integration (Angell 1942; 1974)

I do not have time in this paper to develop the origins of this societal discontinuity. Suffice it to say that four interlocking factors of revolutionary import have combined to produce the contemporary crisis: the rupture in the time frames of society (how work and non-work time are allocated), changes in the division of labor, (the decline of technical labor due to automation), scientific and technological changes, (they make possible greater productivity with less manpower) and aesthetic-ethical mutations, (new values evolving from people's use and increasing desire for leisure), major changes in the world's economy (Drucher 1968), and the rise to prominence of new forms of knowledge (Bell 1973; 1976; Drucher 1968). The end result is both a crisis in industrial societies (Birnbaum 1977) and experimentation with new cultural forms which represent the base of post industrial society. I want to try and outline what the new solidarity looks like.

Table 1

Distribution of Work in the U.S., 1947 and 1976

	1947	% of work force	1976	% of work force
Primary Sector (in 1,000s of workers)				
mining	952	1.8	770	.9
agriculture	7,891	15.2	3,417	3.9
Total	8,843	17.0	4,147	4.8
Secondary Sector (in 1,000s of workers)				
construction	1,982	3.8	5,162	5.9
manufacturing	15,942	20.7	20,044	22.9
Total	17,924	34.6	25,206	28.8
Tertiary Sector (Service Sector) (in 1,000s of workers)				
transportation and public utilities	4,166	8.0	5,652	6.5
trade	8,955	17.2	18,025	20.6
finance, insurance, real estate	1,754	3.3	4,793	5.4
services (business, personal, professional and entertainments)	5,050	9.7	24,829	28.0
government (those who are uniquely involved in uniquely governmental activities)	5,474	10.5	4,793	5.0
Total	25,399	49.0	58,092	65.5
Total Work Force	51,772		87,485	

Source: The U.S. Fact Book: The Statistical Abstracts of the U.S., 1977, p. 365 and Seymour Wolfbein, Work in American Society. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1971, 33-34.

First, it is a social product of the division of labor and leisure. We must understand what has happened to the way time is divided, used, and perceived. In recent decades new electronic technologies such as cybernetics have reduced the division of technical labor. Fewer persons are needed to do fragmented, mechanical, repetitive jobs in the productive process.

Second, the work force now is predominantly in the services (transportation, public utilities, trade, finance, insurance, real estate, government and business, personal, professional and entertainment services). Table I illustrates these changes in recent decades.

(Insert Table I about here)

The largest part of the services includes people who work for government, business, entertainment, recreation, tourism, hospitals, universities, schools, and religious organizations. Their work is clearly different from that of farmers or construction and assembly line workers. Physical demands are much less. Working conditions are different. The office building has replaced the factory. Formal training, specialized knowledge, and problem solving abilities have much greater importance (Bell 1973.)

These new forms of work growing out of a service economy (Fuchs 1968; Bell 1973) have affected the time frames of all workers which in turn have had an impact on social times or the rhythmic patterns in general. Though the majority of the work force is in the services there are a good number of workers who are in the production sector. Scientific and technological changes have reduced the necessity for workers to labor as many hours, while productivity has continued to grow. If hours and days had not been reduced,

there would be massive unemployment. This technological displacement has been handled by the systematic reduction in work time and the rescheduling of when people are on the job. Thus the decrease in work time has allowed more people to work and given workers a greater amount of freed time to manage (Riesman 1964: 176; Kreps 1976). Decreased work time has touched almost everyone in the work force except the self-employed, professional types, and those who choose to work longer, usually due to economic pressures. In the service sector, the division of social labor has continued unabated. But much of the division of work is done to keep people employed and earning money with which they can consume. Much of what goes on in offices, bureaus, organizations of all types is non-essential from a strict efficiency point of view. However people have education and must be employed. They must furthermore be given a modicum of job satisfaction. This phenomenom of necessary white collar employment Bessman and Vidich (1971) call the white collar WPA. Without it our economy would be in deep trouble. So what we see is a form of job sharing going on throughout the economy. For the primary and secondary sectors it is in the form of shorter hours, days, years, and work life. That way more people can be employed. In the services, the division of social labor keeps proliferating, thus allowing more and more persons to be employed. Some of what they do is essential. Much is not, from a strict efficiency perspective. However, for the functioning of the economy most people have to be employed. Due to the impact of the scientific and technological changes, especially in electronics leading to automation and cybernation, the social times are radically changing. Elsewhere I have called this a mutation in social time.[2] (Bosserman, 1975). Upwards to 70% of one's week is freed from obligatory work. Scheduling

has become another potent source of changed social rhythms. Workers can more easily choose the schedule they would like to follow for the day, week, year and life. Various plans have cropped up in Europe and here which underline diverse possibilities and actual experiments going on. (Best 1978; Best, Bosserman and Stern 1979; Bosserman 1971). This mutation in social times, then, is ushering in significant changes throughout the social body. We are only now beginning to appreciate them.

The revolution as social times is a major source of the new solidarity. What this has produced is a division of labor and leisure. The intertwining of these two is important to analyze. First, on the labor side we note a double dynamic: the decrease in the division of technical labor and the increase in the division of social labor in the service sector. This is not to discount the fact that there is technical labor in the services. Automation has made a dent in the services as well. Succinctly, work has changed: the way it is done, the purpose it holds, the goals people have, the meaning work connotes, the centrality of it for the worker. Co-mingling with work is leisure. For the differentiation of time which we have discussed above means the reallocation of time between work and non-work in startingly different quantities and forms. Leisure is non-work as I use the term. Paid work cannot be leisure. Leisure, as a concrete reality, is more than a state of mind or an attitude about something. Leisure is a specific type of time, a particular type of activity, voluntarily engaged in, and entered into with a specific mind set or attitude. Because this leisure has increased so drastically in recent decades. The life-styles and values coming out of leisure are reverberating like waves of sound through an echo chamber. Every

institutional area is affected. The family, religion, education, government, and the economy are feeling these pulsations. A reversal of priorities has taken place. People no longer rest to go back to work. Rather they work to leisure. It is for these reasons that I see the nascent social solidarity coming out of the division of both labor and leisure.

The New Social Solidarity

I shall call the new social solidarity corporate communalism.[3] We have just noted the differentiation which has occurred between work and non-work time. Pre-industrial societies did not sharply demarcate the time frames between obligatory activity and voluntary behavior. (Kaplan 1975) The dividing line was indistinct. With industrialization came the acute division of labor that produced organic solidarity. Time became increasingly mechanized and fragmented. The social times of the industrial order were and are under the hegemony of the Clock. Thus we speak of an eight hour day, a forty hour week, a three week vacation, etc. In union contracts, work time is calculated to the minute and so are breaks, weekends, and work years.

Within the differentiated area of non-work time we find leisure. Here differentiation continues unabated. Societally, leisure is now a mass phenomenon rather than a prerogative of a leisure class. The ways people leisure are differentiated according to amounts of income, education, freed

time, occupation, age, religion, availability of leisure services and resources, and the extent of communication of different leisure life-styles. Leisure, then, in modern societies is highly differentiated and complex.

Granted that the pressures of the market place control and limit leisure experiences to a large extent, there is none-the-less a wide number of choices people have for their leisuring. The very existence of freed time has a broad influence on institutional life. Such "lumps of leisure", as Juanita Kreps calls them, give folks time spaces in which to think things through. That in itself has revolutionary import. (Bosserman 1971). What is important? Where am I going? Where is justice and beauty? What is the good life for others and me?

There is a growing awareness that we have entered a period of decadence and crisis (Harrington 19 ; Moscivici 1977; Touraine, 1977; Birnbaum 1977; Sorokin 1941). Awareness is the offspring of crisis. From it comes experimentation and the search for new forms, structures, social, political and economic arrangements which will realize these goals. (Thomas 1928). Emerging from varied sources are "new" ideas for contending with the crisis of our period. Moscivici (1977: 141-2) explains the crisis this way:

> Progress rarefies previously plentiful natural resources--oil, water, minerals--and produces fruit that does not nourish us, wheat that can not be made into bread and bread that does not satisfy... We used to believe that we were about to master the secret of life and matter, but by destroying cities and countryside we prove our inability to master ourselves and inhabit our own planet.
>
> Little by little the world is being turned upside down. The results obtained from any endeavor are usually the opposite from what we sought, and limits appear in the very place from which they were to vanish--limits on resources and men and limits to our tinkering with things, organic and inorganic.

New value emphases are being created by the division of labor and leisure. The result of this novel differentiation is diverse life-styles creating alternative axial values. A central notion of these core values is corporate communalism. This nascent solidarity emphasizes the centrality of the person (Dumazedier 1974; Dumazedier and Samuel 1977), authentic social relationships within community (Bosserman 1977) the sacredness of nature (Yankelovich 1978; Musgrave 1974), the importance of size ["small is beautiful": larger scale organizations and conglomerations are ugly, (Schumacher 1975)], and the search for simplicity exemplified in the desire to get away "from the rat race" (Passim 1974). These values imply a scaling down of size, a recovery of community, an appreciation of tradition, a new form of differentiated labor in which individuals diversify (Steffes 1979). This is likely only where the economic and political scale is much smaller and decentralized, and an expression of affect is able to break the "iron cage" (Weber 1930) of bureaucratic rationalization. (Musgrave 1974).

Counter Currents

The content of corporate communalism looks strangely déjà vu. You could easily point to the 1960's and such works as Roszak's The Making of a Counter Culture (1969) and Reich's The Greening of America (1970). Many assert the youthful political and cultural revolution died with the draft and the Vietnam war. I think such persons write off in too facile a fashion the legacy of the counter culture. The culture's main ideas and applications persist in various guises. I have noted some of them in this description of corporate communalism. However, there are serious counter currents which defuse and emasculate the content of these new cultural patterns.

First, the marketplace. The future of labor and leisure is under the control of a market system based on profit and constant growth which in turn, depends upon an expanding consumerism. (In my area people are cajoled to go shopping rather than to the beach. There is no fear of sunburn or inclement weather in a shopping mall.) Advertising manages demand and limits choices. Credit buying subtlely hooks people. They get into financial ruts out of which it becomes nearly impossible to extricate themselves. The end result is stuckness. This applies to job (no mobility), marriage (the two incomes are essential), life-style (the car is a necessity--"I really can't do or be what I want"). Interestingly, Americans have grown to distrust big cartels. The oil cartel is lying as they see it. They are convinced political and economic power is in the hands of a rich elite. As for leisure, the arts, sport and recreation, are in many respects co-opted by the market and guided by it. In other words much of leisure consumption is market managed. (Boskoff 1978).

Second, the commitment to progress. Though outmoded, progress persists as a powerful force which destroys natural resources and riches. Again I turn to Moscivici (1977:141)

> The more exacerbated the struggle against nature becomes, the more we celebrate the inimitable works of research and industry--and the more this struggle turns against us, because it saps our very nature, ruining such irreplaceable masterpieces as a species, a material, a tree, or an animal. As sciences advances faster and faster, the abyss widens which separates it from other knowledge...The more light is shed, the more people feel the shadows of their ignorance deepen, the mysteries of their tangible universe multiply, near objects become invisible. The more progress claims to bring aboundance and narrow the gap between the living standards of nations, the more we realize that progress is busy maintaining rarity and producing differences. Statistics prove this incontestably.

The ideology of progress bites deeply into the national psyche. It is a most potent enemy of nature, human and otherwise. (Boskoff 1978). Progress is closely related to growth and size. The limits of size are so apparent as we analyze what has happened to community, the contours and conditions of human freedom. The increasing specialization of the division of labor has not been able to overcome the negative features of large-scale organizations which put people in iron cages; cages which are forged from the alienation of bigness and the debilitating effects or over-rationalized organization. The AFL-CIO Communications Workers of America have recently mounted a campaign against dehumanizing job pressures. These include compulsory overtime work, arbitrary absenteeism controls and computerized scheduling so exacting that it results in what the union derisively calls "timed potty breaks." Their slogan: "We are people, not machines." (Washington Post 1979)

The new solidarity of corporate communalism seems fragile indeed before the power of the market place and the ideology of progress. However, necessity is powerful too and seems to mother a new invention, in this case, a social invention.

Conclusion

I have tried within the space and time constraints of this paper to sketch the emerging pattern of modern social development. I have emphasized the importance of the mutation in time and the subsequent appearance of modern forms of leisure; how this leisure has given birth to new values which are intersecting with critical changes in the work structure of the society.

These social forces are converging to create a new social solidarity based on the division of labor and leisure. In closing I want to express some thoughts about the nature of social development. I find evolutionary theory such as that of Parsons (1977) limiting and lacking in reality. A growing group of theorists are challenging stages of growth through which every society must pass. They predominently come from the Third World or Third World studies. (Ponce 1974; Dos Santos 1970; Cardoso 1971; Balandier 1973; Amin 1976; Eisenstadt 1978; Horowitz 1972). In short, they assert the plurality of development patterns. From this I extrapolate that increased growth, specialization, differentiation may be dysfunctional. Adaption may be just the opposite; regressive states may be highly probable, in fact desirable, if de-differentiation is the meaning of smaller scale, simplicity, and no-growth (Boskoff 1978; Kaplan 1975). Modernity has reached a limit, a boundary from which a choice is to be made as to the new direction it will take. The choices as well are limited (Sorokin 1937; Meadows, et al 1972; Tiryakian 1978b). Rather than a metaphor of progress and developmental growth (Nisbet 1969) I would substitute Moscivici's "Reenchantment of the world". Here we enter the world of Leisure. Leisure as an idea and ideal is filled with fantasy, imagination, and creativity. (Butler 1975; Cox 1969). Modern science and political economies have destroyed and demystified nature (a very certain aspect of secularization), and overturned the traditional views of the sacred and the profane.

The implications in all of this for sociology and the sociology of leisure are important. Sociology currently lacks a positive overarching "scientific research program" (Tiryakian 1979; Lakatos 1970; Boskoff 1978)

or paradigm (Kuhn 1962). The last paradigm which had hegemony over the discipline, that of the Parsonians, faded with the disjunctive events of the late 1960's (Tiryakian 1978a). I would propose that sociology seriously consider two central foci for its work during the next several years, even decades: the new cultural values, creative ideals, and visions of the sacred implicit in a new solidarity, and the processes of social organization, i.e., structuration, re-structuration which take place in periods of societal discontinuity.

The first focus must look at social phenomena located at the deepest levels of social reality (Gurvitch 1957;1963). Leisure, religion in its non-institutional forms (Tiryakian 1967), and the arts, and their interrelationships, are the sectors of culture to which sociology needs to address itself.[4] The second focus on social structure must take into account the social organization of corporate communalism or whatever we wish to denote this new social solidarity of a post-industrial era. Alvin Boskoff (1978:16) has suggested in a stimulating paper that "we may have to develop and apply extended notions of structural limitations or deficiencies (rather than limitations in material resources or in psychological capabilities), of networks of organizational adaptation, of structural (rather than interpersonal) compromise, and of adaptive structural alternatives--to deal with complex societies in the context of technological inhibition." He points out that sociology has not really taken into account the possibility that evolution may not mean ever increasing complexity and division of technical labor. Perhaps "adaptive upgrading" towards simplicity is necessary, given

the limits of resources and the socially negative by-products of over-ripe sensate structures. Whatever the case, the proper domain of sociology is social integration and how it changes. A new solidarity as a new ordering of axial values, has to do with both these pivotal themes. The study of the contours of a new solidarity gives sociology a potential scientific research program or paradigm it currently is lacking.

FOOTNOTES

[1]I have adopted Gurvitch's interpretation (1957) of Durkheim. He understands la division du travail social to mean that social labor is distinct from technical labor. The latter has to do solely with how particular technological devices shape the work task.

[2]Social time means the temporal pattern or patterns each group creates. Temporality is essential to the formation of a group's sense of order. Likewise, each group's conception of time is a powerful social force affecting all of social life. For discussions of social time see Gurvitch 1964, Sorokin and Merton 1937, Tiryakian 1978, and Bosserman 1975.

[3]The idea for calling this type of solidarity corporate communalism comes from two principal sources. First, Durkheim's discussion of "the corporation," as a solution to the ills of organic solidarity, is part of the derivation. Second, Gurvitch's excellent critique of the concepts of solidarity as articulated by Durkheim, Tonnies, von Wiese, and Scheler led him to propose three types of solidarity: mass, community, and communion. He further lays out an emerging type of "global society" which is decentralist, directed by the citizens themselves through a federalist polity. I have titled the emerging solidarity corporate communalism in order to incorporate the themes of small size, ethnic and cultural identity, concern for the environment, the desire for interpersonal contact, and the sanctity of the person.

It is interesting to conjecture what the nascent solidarity implies in terms of economic factors. St. Simon wrote perceptively about the new industrial order of the early 19th century. He saw the productivity of labor and capital as central to that economic system. People regulated consumption and managed productivity within the physical and social environmental limits of growth seem to be the features of the new corporate communal order.

Just as scientific knowledge and industry form the coupling of modern society, in the same way as did theological knowledge and feudalism for medieval society, so intuitive, probabilistic knowledge and decentralized citizen-managed corporate communalism form the basis of post-modern society.

[4]The sociology of culture has been neglected by the mainstream of sociology. This is ironic since the Durkheimian school, which ushered in the modern era of sociology, concentrated much of its work on religion, art and other aspects of culture. The Chicago school which followed the Durkheimians as the dominant school during the 1920's and 30s also developed the sociological study of culture.

REFERENCES

Angell, Robert Cooley
1942 "The Social Integration of Selected American Cities," American Journal of Sociology, 47 (January): 572-92.

1974 "The Moral Integration of American Cities II," American Journal of Sociology, 80 (November): 607-629.

Amin, Samir
1976 Unequal Development: An Essay on the Social Formation of Peripheral Capitalism. Tr. by Brian Pearce. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Balandier, Georges, ed.
1973 Sociologie des mutations. 2d ed. Paris: Anthropos.

Bell, Daniel
1973 The Coming of Post-Industrial Society. New York: Basic Books

1976 The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism. New York: Basic Books

Bensman, Joseph and Arthur J. Vidich
1971 The New American Society. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.

Best, Fred
1978 "Recycling People: Work-sharing Through Flexible Life Scheduling," The Futurist (Feb.)

Best, Fred, Phillip Bosserman, and Barry Stern
1979 "Income-Free Time Trade-off Preferences of U.S. Workers," Leisure Studies (forthcoming)

Birnbaum, Norman, ed.
1977 Beyond the Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boskoff, Alvin
1978 "Potential Social Change and Needed Revisions in Theory." Paper presented at the Southern Sociological Society.

Bosserman, Phillip
1977 "Changing Core Values in American Society, 1876-1976." Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Chicago.

1975 "Dynamics in the Allocation of Work and Non-work Time in the United States Society, 1920-1970," Society and Leisure.

Bosserman, Phillip
1975 "Some Theoretical Dimensions to the Study of Social Time," Society and Leisure.

1971 "Youth and Leisure" in Max Kaplan and Phillip Bosserman, eds., Technology, Human Values and Leisure. New York: Abingdon Press.

Butler, Nelson
1974 "The Influence of Technology and Industrialization on Life Style," Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Nov.-Dec., 9-10.

Cordoso, Fernando H.
1971 Dependencia y desarollo en America Latina. Mexico: Siglo Vintiuno Press.

Cox, Harvey
1971 Feast of Fools. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Dos Santos, Theotonio "The Structure of Dependency," American Economic Review. 60 (May).

Dumazedier, Joffre
1974 Sociology of Leisure. New York: Elsevier.

Dumazedier, Joffre and Nicole Samuel
1976 Société éducative et pouvoir culturel. Paris: Editions du Seuil

Durkheim, Emile
1933 The Division of Labor in Society. New York: Macmillan.

Eisenstudt, S.N.
1978 Revolution and Transformation of Societies. New York: The Free Press.

Fuch, Victor
1968 The Service Economy. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Gurvitch, Georges
1963 Determinismes sociaux et liberté humaine. Paris: PUF.

1957 and 1963 La vocation actuelle de la sociologie, Vol. I and Vol. II. Paris: PUF.

Harrington, Michael
1966 The Accidental Century. Baltimore, Md. Penguin Books.

Horowitz, Irving Louis
1972 Three Worlds of Development. 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, Max
1975 Leisure: Theory and Policy. New York: John Wiley.

Kreps, Juanita
1976
"Some Time Dimensions of Manpower Policy" in Eli Ginzberg, ed., Jobs for Americans. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall. 184-205

Kuhn, Thomas S.
1962
The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. University of Chicago Press.

Lakatos, Image
1970
"Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes" in Image Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, eds., Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Meadows, Donella H., Dennis L. Meadows, et al.
1972
The Limits of Growth. New York: Universe Books.

Moscivici, Serge
1977
"The Reenchantment of the World" in Horman Birnbaum, ed. Beyond the Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press. 133-168.

Musgrave, Frank
1974
Ecstasy and Holiness. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nisbet, Robert A.
1969
Social Change in History. New York: Oxford University Press.

Parsons, Talcott
1977
The Evolution of Societies. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Passim, Herbert
1975
"Changing Values: Work and Growth in Japan," Asian Survey, Vol. 15 (Oct.)

Ponce, Sangineo, Carlos, et al.
1974
Dependencia, historia y Revolucion Technologica. Las Pas, Bolivia: Edicionces Pumapunku.

Reich, Charles
1970
The Greening of America. New York: Random House.

Riesman, David
1964
Abundance for What? New York: Anchor Books

Roszale, Theodore
1969
The Making of a Counter Culture. Sarden City, N.Y.: Doubleday.

Schumacher, E.F. 1973 — Small Is Beautiful: Economics As If People Mattered. New York: Harper

Sorokin, P.A. 1937-1941 — Social and Cultural Dynamics, Vol. IV. New York: American Book Company.

Steffes, Edward 1979 — "Future Patterns of Work and Leisure" Unpublished manuscript.

Thomas, W.I. 1928 — The Child in America. New York: Knopf.

Tiryakian, Edward A. 1967 — "A Model of Societal Change and Its Lead Indicators" in Samuel Klausner, The Study of Total Societies. New York: Frederick A. Praeger.

1978a — "The School as the Unit of Analysis: Rethinking the History of Sociology." Paper prepared for the 9th World Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden.

1979 — "The Significance of Schools in the Development of Sociology" in Snizek, William, et al., Contemporary Issues in Theory and Research: A Methodological Perspective. Westport, Conn.: Greenwood.

1978b — "The Time Perspective of Modernity," Loisir et Société/Society and Leisure, Vol.1, No. 1

Touraine, Alain 1977 — "Introduction" and "Crisis or Tranformation" in Norman Birnbaum, ed. Beyond the Crisis. New York: Oxford University Press. 3-48.

Washington Post 1979 — "Worker Protest Dehumanizing Jobs." A3

Weber, Max 1930 — The Protestant Ethic and the Rise of Capitalism. London: Allen and Unwin

Yankelovich, Daniel 1978 — "The New Psychological Contracts at Work," Psychology Today (May)